UBS OPPOSITION TO GLR REQUEST FOR PAYMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE RENT

UBS AG, London Branch and UBS AG, Stamford Branch ("UBS") respectfully submit this opposition to GLR, LLC's ("GLR") *Request for Payment of Administrative Rent* [Docket No. 801] (the "Motion"). The Motion is yet another attempt by Mr. Randeep S. Grewal¹—now acting as GLR's stated "principal"—to seek preferential treatment based on questionable claims against the estate. The Motion should be denied.

First, GLR should not receive any purported "administrative" rent for the Lakeview Office or the Lakeview Warehouse (the "Lakeview Property") while the Trustee's adversary complaint against GLR for avoidance and recovery of fraudulent transfers remains pending. See Mot. at 1. That action alleges—and is supported by evidence in the public record—that the Debtor quitclaimed all of its interest in the Lakeview Property to GLR just six days before the Petition Date while both entities were under Mr. Grewal's control. See Case No. 9:20-ap-01006-MB at Docket No. 1 (Complaint) ¶ 21, Ex. 2 (Quitclaim Deed). The Quitclaim Deed specifically identifies the Lakeview Property—including assessor parcel numbers (APN) 129-120-26 and 129-170-27 and provides that the Debtor "relinquishes [and] surrenders ... any and all right, title, and interest" therein to GLR effective July 19, 2019. See id. at pp. 14, 25 (Legal Description)². These are the same APN's shown on the lease on which GLR now seeks payment. See Mot. at 6 (Lakeview Office and Warehouse Lease) ¶ 1(a), (b). Based on the specific identification of the Lakeview Property in the Quitclaim deed executed by the Debtor in favor of GLR, a reasonable inference can be drawn that, prior to execution of the Quitclaim Deed, the Debtor and not GLR was the owner of the Lakeview Property, which would necessarily mean the lease agreement submitted by GLR in support of its motion is invalid on its face. At a minimum, GLR's demand for rent on real property that the Debtor quitclaimed to GLR less than a week before the Petition Date is highly suspect.

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

28

¹ On October 16, 2019, this Court approved the Trustee's appointment following motions by UBS; the California State Lands Commission; the California Department of Conservation Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources; the Santa Barbara County Air Pollution District and Tax Collector; and Buganko, LLC, citing Mr. Grewal's gross mismanagement, malfeasance, insider transactions, environmental infractions, and failure to pay royalties. See Docket No. 409

²⁶²⁷

² The Deed appears to have been executed on January 16, 2019, but was not recorded until July 19, 2019. <u>Id.</u> at p. 14. Under Mr. Grewal's control, the Debtor filed its Chapter 11 petition on July 25, 2019. <u>See</u> Docket No. 1 (Petition).

Case 9:19-bk-11573-MB Doc 829 Filed 02/27/20 Entered 02/27/20 12:54:50 Desc Main Document Page 3 of 9

Further, the Motion is unsupported by sufficient evidence of GLR's entitlement to postpetition rent. Mr. Grewal's supporting declaration makes no mention of GLR's ownership of the
property or role as the Debtor's "landlord." See Mot. at 1; cf. Mot. at 4–5 (Grewal Declaration).

Conspicuously, the declaration also fails to establish that the Debtor ever made prepetition rent
payments to GLR or even occupied the premises. See Mot. at 4–5 (Grewal Declaration). Nor is it
plausible that the lease attached to the Motion was an arms-length transaction. The Trustee has
indicated he has located new leased space for the Debtor's headquarters at \$5,000 per month,
whereas the rent under the Lakeview Property lease is 50% higher at \$7,500 per month. See Docket
No. 812 (Trustee's Motion to Reject Lakeview Lease) at 7–8. That amounts to approximately
\$30,000 in overcharges per year.³

Given the suspicious nature of the Quitclaim Deed and the lease, GLR's claim for administrative rent should be disallowed until its ownership of the property and entitlement to rent are properly investigated and determined in the context of the Trustee's adversary proceeding. See 11 U.S.C. § 502(d) ("[T]he court shall disallow any claim of any entity from which property is recoverable under Section ... 550 ... of this title or that is a transferee of a[n avoidable] transfer ... unless such entity or transferee has paid the amount, or turned over any such property, for which such entity or transferee is liable[.]"); In re MicroAge, Inc., 291 B.R. 503, 508–12 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2002) (holding that "§ 502(d) may be raised in response to the allowance of an administrative claim"; that "[n]othing in the plain language of § 502(d) limits its application to prepetition claims"; and that "the bankruptcy court erred when it held that § 502(d) does not apply to claims for expenses of administration").

<u>Second</u>, GLR's request for immediate allowance and payment of administrative rent is premature. Bankruptcy courts within the Ninth Circuit have consistently recognized that—notwithstanding Section 365(d)(3)'s directive that the "trustee shall timely perform" its obligations under non-residential real property leases—deferral is appropriate in cases of potential

³ Further, the Lakeview Property lease was executed on behalf of the Debtor by Susan Whalen. Mot. at 8 (Lease). UBS is informed Ms. Whalen acted as general counsel for *all* of the "Greka" entities controlled by Mr. Grewal (including GLR). And Mr. Grewal, who executed the lease for GLR, was admittedly the Debtor's Chairman.

As the Orvo court explained, "[a]lthough section 365(d)(3) calls for timely performance of the debtor's lease obligations, there is no indication that Congress intended to grant landlords some type of super-priority status." Id. at 728. "Accordingly, most courts addressing the issue have held that where there are insufficient funds in the estate to satisfy all administrative claims, a landlord is only entitled to its pro rata share with the other allowed administrative claimants." Id. see also In re LPM Corp., 269 B.R. 217, 223 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2001), aff'd, 300 F.3d 1134 (9th Cir. 2002) ("[W]e are still bound by Orvo's holding that an administrative claim under § 365(d)(3) does not entitle a landlord to superpriority status if the estate is administratively insolvent."); In re Bryant Universal Roofing, Inc., 218 B.R. 948, 953 (Bankr. D. Ariz. 1998) ("Other courts within the Ninth Circuit have followed Orvoo, and this Court will also."); In re MS Freight Distribution, Inc., 172 B.R. 976, 978 (Bankr. W.D. Wash. 1994) (same); In re Tandem Grp., Inc., 61 B.R. 738, 742 (Bankr. C.D. Cal. 1986) (pending determination of sufficiency of available funds, "the court postpones its determination of the amount of administrative rent due and owing to moving party").

The Trustee has acknowledged the risk of administrative insolvency at numerous hearings in this case; and his pleadings indicate there may be insufficient funds to pay administrative claims in full. See Docket No. 698 (Trustee's Fee Application) at ¶¶ 6, 7. The United States Trustee has also identified a "concern that there may be insufficient monies to … pay the Debtor's post-petition obligations going forward." See Docket No. 711 (UST Objection to Fee Applications) at 1–2. GLR's administrative rent claim should not be allowed or paid until the Trustee determines whether sufficient cash will become available to pay all administrative claims, not just those of GLR. Until that occurs, GLR is protected by the Trustee's retention of rent payments in escrow.

Finally, GLR has failed to articulate any sound basis for this Court to overturn its multiple

Case 9:19-bk-11573-MB Doc 829 Filed 02/27/20 Entered 02/27/20 12:54:50 Desc Main Document Page 5 of 9

prior orders prohibiting the Debtor from making rent payments to insiders and affiliates, including one negotiated by Mr. Grewal at the first day hearings.⁴ GLR's contention that these orders do not apply because GLR is not an "insider" or "affiliate" of the Debtor, Mot. at 2, contradicts prior admissions by the Debtor's former Chairman, Mr. Randeep Grewal, and are incorrect as a matter of law. Mr. Grewal testified at the first-day hearings that he owns and controls GLR, and that GLR is an "affiliate" and "sister company" of the Debtor:

THE COURT: And who is GLR? Is this an affiliate, is it somebody else? THE WITNESS: It's an affiliate? THE COURT: Okay. What's the nature of the corporate relationship? [...] Is it a parent, is it a sister company? What is it? THE WITNESS: It's owned -- for example, I am a director of GLR, so it's affiliated with my management position at GLR. So to answer your question, Your Honor, a sister company. THE COURT: Okay.

See 8/1/2019 Hr'g Tr. (First Day Hearing) at 35:9-21. Mr. Grewal's declaration in support of the Motion again confirms he is GLR's "principal." Mot. at 4 (Grewal declaration) ¶ 1.

In addition, UBS is informed and believes that both the Debtor and GLR are indirectly owned by Mr. Grewal. Therefore, GLR is an "affiliate" of the Debtor pursuant to Section 101(2)(B) of the Bankruptcy Code. Further, the Bankruptcy Code defines "insider" non-exclusively to "include ... any affiliate, or insider of an affiliate" as well as any "director, officer, or person in control of the Debtor." 11 U.S.C. § 101(31)(B)(i)-(iii), (D) (emphasis added). Mr. Grewal (the Debtor's prior Chairman) and GLR (his wholly-controlled "sister company" of the Debtor) both fit within the statutory definition of "insider" and are bound by the restrictions in the financing orders. Those orders were expressly designed to prevent the Debtor from making rent (and royalty)

⁴ <u>See</u> Docket No. 43 (Interim Cash Collateral Order) at ¶ 9 ("Absent further order of the Court or written consent of UBS ... the Debtor shall not make ... any ... surface lease payments to insiders or affiliates of the Debtor ... but the Debtor shall hold any such payments in an interest-bearing escrow or segregated account"); Docket No. 572 (Final DIP Order) at ¶ 15 (same).

⁵ The first day hearing transcript was admitted into evidence without objection at this Court's cash collateral trial on October 3-4, 2019 as Exhibit "UBS-18." It also appears on the docket as Exhibit 15 to the *Declaration of Samantha Indelicato in Support of Objection of UBS AG, London Branch to Debtor's Motion for Final Order Approving Use of Cash Collateral*, see Docket No. 121-19, and as Exhibit 18 to the *Declaration of Samantha Indelicato in Support of UBS AG, London Branch's Motion to Appoint a Chapter 11 Trustee* filed on October 7, 2019, see Docket No. 365-18.

PROOF OF SERVICE OF DOCUMENT

2

1

I am over the age of eighteen and not a party to this bankruptcy case or adversary proceeding. My business address is 400 South Hope Street, Los Angeles, California 90071-2899.

4

5

3

A true and correct copy of the foregoing document entitled UBS AG, LONDON BRANCH'S OPPOSITION TO GLR, LLC'S REQUEST FOR PAYMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE RENT [DKT. No. 801] will be served or was served (a) on the judge in chambers in the form and manner required by LBR 5005-2(d); and (b) in the manner indicated below:

6

7

8

9

I. TO BE SERVED BY THE COURT VIA NOTICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING ("NEF"): Pursuant to controlling General Order(s) and Local Bankruptcy Rule(s) ("LBR"), the foregoing document will be served by the court via NEF and hyperlink to the document. On 2/27/20, I checked the CM/ECF docket for this bankruptcy case or adversary proceeding and determined that the following person(s) are on the Electronic Mail Notice List to receive NEF transmission at the email address(es) indicated below:

10

William C Beall will@beallandburkhardt.com, carissa@beallandburkhardt.com

11

Alicia Clough aclough@loeb.com, mnielson@loeb.com,ladocket@loeb.com

12

Marc S Cohen mscohen@loeb.com, klyles@loeb.com

13

Alec S DiMario alec.dimario@mhllp.com, debra.blondheim@mhllp.com;

14

Syreeta.shoals@mhllp.com

15

 $\textbf{Karl J Fingerhood} \ \texttt{karl.fingerhood} \ @usdoj.gov, efile_ees.enrd \ @usdoj.gov$

16

H Alexander Fisch Alex.Fisch@doj.ca.gov

17

Don Fisher dfisher@ptwww.com, tblack@ptwww.com

18

Brian D Fittipaldi brian.fittipaldi@usdoj.gov

19

Ellen Friedman efriedman@friedmanspring.com

20

 $\textbf{Gisele M Goetz} \ \underline{gmgoetz@hbsb.com}, \ \underline{ggoetz@collegesoflaw.edu}$

21

Karen L Grant kgrant@silcom.com

22

Ira S Greene Ira.Greene@lockelord.com

23

Matthew C. Heyn Matthew. Heyn@doj.ca.gov, mcheyn@outlook.com

24

Brian L Holman b.holman@musickpeeler.com

25

Eric P Israel eisrael@DanningGill.com, danninggill@gmail.com;

26

eisrael@ecf.inforuptcy.com

2728

Razmig Izakelian razmigizakelian@quinnemanuel.com

- 7 -

1	Alan H Katz akatz@lockelord.com
2	John C Keith john.keith@doj.ca.gov
3	Jeannie Kim jkim@friedmanspring.com
4	Mitchell J Langberg mlangberg@bhfs.com, dcrudup@bhfs.com
5	Maxim B Litvak mlitvak@pszjlaw.com
6	Michael Authur McConnell (TR) Michael.mcconnell@kellyhart.com
7	Brian M Metcalf bmetcalf@omm.com
8	David L Osias dosias@allenmatkins.com, bcrfilings@allenmatkins.com,
9	kdemorest@allenmatkins.com, csandoval@allenmatkins.com
10	Darren L Patrick dpatrick@omm.com, darren-patrick-1373@ecf.pacerpro.com;
11	sindelicato@omm.com;ejones@omm.com
12	Jeffrey N Pomerantz jpomerantz@pszjlaw.com
13	Benjamin P Pugh bpugh@ecg.law, mwoo@ecg.law, mhamburger@ecg.law,
14	calendar@ecg.law
15	Edward S Renwick erenwick@hanmor.com, iaguilar@hanmor.com
16	J Alexandra Rhim arhim@hrhlaw.com
17	Todd C. Ringstad becky@ringstadlaw.com, arlene@ringstadlaw.com
18	Mitchell E Rishe mitchell.rishe@doj.ca.gov
19	Zev Shechtman zshechtman@DanningGill.com,
20	danninggill@gmail.com;zshechtman@ecf.inforuptcy.com
21	Sonia Singh ssingh@DanningGill.com, danninggill@gmail.com,
22	ssingh@ecf.inforuptcy.com
23	Daniel A Solitro dsolitro@lockelord.com, ataylor2@lockelord.com
24	Ross Spence ross@snowspencelaw.com, janissherrill@snowspencelaw.com;
25	donnasutton@snowspencelaw.com;brittanyDecoteau@snowspencelaw.com
26	Christopher D Sullivan esullivan@diamondmccarthy.com,
27	mdomer@diamondmccarthy.com;kmartinez@diamondmccarthy.com
28	Jennifer Taylor jtaylor@omm.com
	- 8 -

Doc 829 Filed 02/27/20 Entered 02/27/20 12:54:50 Desc

Case 9:19-bk-11573-MB